

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Affiliation/Organization (Optional):

Answered 26
Skipped 14

Anonymous	
Anonymous	
Anonymous	
Richard F. Ambrose	UCLA
Walter Lamb	Ballona Wetlands Land Trust
Shelley Luce	Heal the Bay
Anonymous	
Lawrence Lovell	Dancing Coyote Enbironmental
Eric Stein	SCCWRP
Christine Whitcraft	CSU Long Beach
Laurie Newman	TBF
Anonymous	
Anonymous	
Bob Godfrey	MARINA DEL REY ANGLERS
Masahiro Dojiri	LA Sanitation & Environment
David Kay	
Suzanne Goode	Ca Department of Parks and Recreation
Anonymous	
Anonymous	
Anonymous	
Peter Glick	Del Rey Yacht Club
Anonymous	
Giovanni Di Franco	Coastal Research Institute
Anonymous	
Anonymous	Coastal Research Intern/TBF
Chris Newman	LACoFD Lifeguard Division

Anonymous

Kathy Knight

Jim Lamm

John H. Dorsey

Phyllis Grifman

Lucien Plauzoles

Anonymous

Anonymous

Douglas Fay

Bill Brand

David Pedersen

Martha Tremblay

Cung Nguyen

Guangyu Wang (on behalf of Jon Bishop and Claire Waggoner)

Ballona Ecosystem Education Project

Ballona Creek Renaissance

Loyola Marymount University

Univ. of Southern Calif. Sea Grant

Santa Monica Bay Audubon Society

Intern

3rd generation SMB environmental activist

City of Redondo Beach - Mayor

Las Virgenes Municipal Water District

LACSD

Los Angeles County Public Works

Ca State Water Resources Control Board


Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

If you are a member of the SMBNEP Management Conference please check here.

Answer Choices	Responses	
I am a member of the SMBNEP Management Conference	100.00%	20
	Marked YES	20
	Skipped	20


Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
 How would you describe your organization's/agency's attendance at SMBNEP public meetings:


13	16%	13	16%	21	05%	31	58%	21	05%	Total	38
Never Have		Have in the past		Sometimes Attend		Regularly Attend		Always Attend		Answered	38
5		5		8		12		8		Skipped	2



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
 How would you describe your organization's/agency's participation in the activities of the SMBNEP:

10.81%	2.70%	16.22%	45.95%	24.32%	Total	37
Not Active	Rarely Active	Sometimes	Active	Very Active	Answered	37
4	1	6	17	9	Skipped	3






Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

What are your organization's/agency's primary reasons for participating in the SMBNEP? (Select all that apply):

Answer Choices	Responses	
Availability of Technical, Policy, and Project Expertise	72.50%	29
Ability to Partner on Grant Funding and Projects	40.00%	16
Assistance in Delivery of Regional Projects/Initiatives	37.50%	15
Assistance with Individual project implementation	55.00%	22
Other (please specify):	37.50%	15
	Answered	40
	Skipped	0





Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
 What are your organization's/agency's primary responsibilities involving Santa Monica Bay and its watersheds?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Flood Management	12.50%	5
Stormwater Management	27.50%	11
Water Supply	20.00%	8
Watershed Management	45.00%	18
Sediment Management	20.00%	8
Hazard/Emergency Planning	17.50%	7
Coastal/Local Planning	30.00%	12
Habitat, Species, Open Space Management	55.00%	22
Climate Change and SLR Vulnerability and Adaptation	32.50%	13
Capital Public Works Planning and Implementation	15.00%	6
Stewardship	50.00%	20
Other (please specify):	27.50%	11
Answered		40
Skipped		0

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
 How familiar are you with the structure and functions of the current SMBNEP Management
 Conference governance?

Not at All	A Little	More than a Little	A Lot	Very informed	Total
12.82%	12.82%	30.77%	15.38%	28.21%	39
5	5	12	6	11	Answered
					Skipped
					39
					1






Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
Effectiveness of Management Conference. Please rate the effectiveness of current Management Conference governance structure in meeting SMBNEP CCMP priorities:

	Don't Know		Not Effective		Somewhat Effective		Effective		Very Effective		Total
Overall	20.51%	8	10.26%	4	7.69%	3	41.03%	16	20.51%	8	39
Developing and Managing Projects	15.38%	6	7.69%	3	5.13%	2	41.03%	16	30.77%	12	39
Making Policy	26.32%	10	13.16%	5	21.05%	8	26.32%	10	13.16%	5	38
Raising and Expending Funds	31.58%	12	5.26%	2	7.89%	3	39.47%	15	15.79%	6	38
Researching and Monitoring Bay Conditions	13.16%	5	7.89%	3	2.63%	1	34.21%	13	42.11%	16	38
Educating and Engaging Stakeholders	18.42%	7	15.79%	6	10.53%	4	34.21%	13	21.05%	8	38
Other (please specify)											5
Answered										39	
Skipped										1	

Walter Lamb	<p>These responses are limited to NEP involvement in projects that the Land Trust monitors or researches. The structure as modified in the last four years has substantially impeded strategic oversight of projects at the Ballona Wetlands. The NEP often seems to behave more like a consulting firm than an organization leading restoration of the Bay and watershed. Opportunistic grant opportunities seem to drive project selection. Again, this response is limited to areas in which we have the highest visibility.</p>
Anonymous	<p>though the individual organization's (e.g. TBF) effectiveness in implementation is very high (tackling LOTS of projects - an impressive amount), there are challenges with the current structure in best meeting those needs. It seems that TBF and SMBRC are very effective in spite of some of the conference challenges.</p>
Kathy Knight	<p>We are disappointed that despite the groups and individuals that have worked hard to save and help acquire the BWER to restore it to the seasonal fresh water wetland that it is - the Governing Board & Executive Comm work against that goal.</p> <p>In general, the governance structure has seemed to be a little unwieldy and probably understaffed for the scope of its mission. It's also hard to adequately respond to this survey given my lack of engagement due to many factors. For BCR (from my perspective), it has been difficult for our all-volunteer organization to actively participate in recent Governing Board and Watershed Advisory Council meetings. However, we continue to be very actively engaged with watershed stakeholders and government reps on many fronts. Among other things, these include (1) creek cleanups, (2) development of and advocacy for local ordinances relating to single-use plastics, and (3) two planning processes led by others on potential multi-benefit projects along Ballona Creek re: stormwater capture and creek revitalization.</p>
Jim Lamm	
Douglas Fay	<p>The initial purpose of the NEP's funding and involvement was to do a 5 year pollution study, followed by recommended mitigation actions and Santa Monica Bay National Marine Sanctuary dedication. Over 3 decades later and millions of dollars wasted, the pollution continues because the scientific and political integrity of the SMBNEP governance has been completely lost. The required oversight at the Federal level is absent. This survey goes to a State of California employee. This action in itself shows how terribly wrong this process is. I demand accountability and request a written response from US EPA in Washington D.C. that states they are aware of my concerns detailed in this survey.</p>



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
Effectiveness of Governing Board/Executive Committee Please rate the effectiveness of current
GB/EC governance structure in meeting SMBNEP CCMP priorities:

	Don't Know	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
Overall	27.03%	10 10.81%	4 2.70%	1 48.65%	18 10.81%	4 37
Developing and Managing Projects	30.56%	11 8.33%	3 11.11%	4 38.89%	14 11.11%	4 36
Making Policy	36.11%	13 8.33%	3 16.67%	6 27.78%	10 11.11%	4 36
Raising and Expending Funds	40.00%	14 2.86%	1 11.43%	4 34.29%	12 11.43%	4 35
Researching and Monitoring Bay Conditions	21.62%	8 8.11%	3 8.11%	3 35.14%	13 27.03%	10 37
Educating and Engaging Stakeholders	19.44%	7 13.89%	5 19.44%	7 30.56%	11 16.67%	6 36
Other (please specify)						7
Answered						37
Skipped						3

Walter Lamb The Governing Board does not exercise its authority and the Executive Committee exercises authority it doesn't have. If these bodies stopped meeting, and final decisions were left to staff, it would not seem to make a substantial difference in the operation or direction of the NEP. The stagnant nature of the Executive Committee hinders fresh perspectives from getting to the Governing Board.


Anonymous EC/GB meeting frequency seems high considering most priorities are implemented by the partners (e.g. TBF). The variety and expertise of agencies and municipalities around the table is beneficial, however.

Kathy Knight What is CCMP? I don't see the initials somewhere previously stated.
Jim Lamm See previous comments.

Douglas Fay You have been extremely effective at discriminated against me to the point that I do not attend SMBRC meetings. You have not been effective at meeting the Mission Statement goal of restoring and enhancing the Santa Monica Bay and it's tributaries. You have changed the Mission Statement to meet your personal goals and ambitions which contradict rationality.

Martha Tremblay I have not looked for executive committee meeting minutes but there is no discussion of what is done for the GB

Cung Nguyen GB/EC not tasked with Raising and Expending Funds



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
Effectiveness of the Watershed Advisory Committee (WAC): Please rate the effectiveness of current
WAC governance structure in meeting SMBNEP CCMP priorities:

Select One:

	Don't Know		Not Effective		Somewhat		Effective		Very Effective		Total
Overall	26.32%	10	23.68%	9	21.05%	8	21.05%	8	7.89%	3	38
Informing and Affecting Project	21.62%	8	16.22%	6	32.43%	12	24.32%	9	5.41%	2	37
Informing and Affecting Policy	36.11%	13	22.22%	8	22.22%	8	13.89%	5	5.56%	2	36
Informing and Affecting Program and Project Funding	37.84%	14	16.22%	6	24.32%	9	13.51%	5	8.11%	3	37
Understanding Research on and Monitoring of Bay Conditions	24.32%	9	27.03%	10	10.81%	4	27.03%	10	10.81%	4	37
Educating and Engaging Stakeholders	27.03%	10	24.32%	9	21.62%	8	16.22%	6	10.81%	4	37
Other (please specify)											11
Answered										38	
Skipped										2	

Anonymous

Some of the participants are unreasonable.

Walter Lamb

What is called the Watershed Advisory Council is in actuality an open stakeholder forum which was previously quite effective in engaging the public, but which has more recently diminished in value and which has never fulfilled the functions outlined in the MOU. I can not name a single function performed by WAC members that is not also equally open to members of the general public. While inclusion of all stakeholders is valuable, it makes the MOU section on the WAC superfluous.

Bob Godfrey

The last meeting was not actively promoted/advertised. Only 8 stake holders attended the last meeting. Nothing much happened..


Anonymous

The WAC has degraded into just a couple of individuals who do not represent a community of watershed stakeholders, and they just end up fighting amongst themselves. The WAC is the key challenge holding up the effectiveness of meeting CCMP priorities. There are several key watershed groups like Surfrider, Heal the Bay, water agencies, municipalities, and Friends of Ballona Wetlands, who all make meaningful contributions to annual work plans and actions/priorities and then there are other individuals who use the meetings as a platform for their own agenda (e.g. lawsuits, complaining about Ballona). The former groups have largely given up on the WAC because of the contentious individuals, and thus further reduced its effectiveness.

Anonymous

In my experience WAC meetings, more often than not, devolve into platforms for special interest groups who dominate discussion. The result is inactivity impacting policy and lack of diverse opinions and voices. I don't find these meetings productive. At All.

Kathy Knight	There were only 8-10 people that came to the 2019 annual meeting on January 24. Some of them complained about how ineffective the meeting is. It seems like it is just a requirement to look good. Although the approximately 20 members of the Governing Board are WAC members, only a couple of them showed up. They do not seem to think it is important either. Our suggestions are not taken seriously and put into practice - such as having meetings with the TAC on the Ballona restoration.
Jim Lamm	See previous comments.
John H. Dorsey	I've never been involved with this aspect of the SMBNEP operations.
Douglas Fay	At the instruction of former SMBRC and WAC member LA County Lifeguard Angus Alexander, I arrived at a WAC meeting intending on participating as outlined in the meeting notification letter. My Public Comment time was shortened and interrupted by the Chairman and I was barred from participating in the Working Groups. It was a totally humiliating experience that I will never forget. Nothing has changed.
Martha Tremblay	I will email comments to Guangyu.
Cung Nguyen	Low Agency Participation



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
Effectiveness of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Please rate the effectiveness of current TAC
governance structure in meeting SMBNEP CCMP priorities:

	Don't Know		Not Effective		Somewhat Effective		Effective		Very Effective		Total
Overall	28.95%	11	7.89%	3	5.26%	2	21.05%	8	36.84%	14	38
Informing and Affecting Projects	24.32%	9	5.41%	2	8.11%	3	21.62%	8	40.54%	15	37
Informing and Affecting Policy	33.33%	12	8.33%	3	13.89%	5	19.44%	7	25.00%	9	36
Researching and Monitoring Bay Conditions	29.73%	11	2.70%	1	2.70%	1	21.62%	8	43.24%	16	37
Informing and Educating Stakeholders	28.95%	11	21.05%	8	10.53%	4	23.68%	9	15.79%	6	38
Other (please specify)											6
										Answered	39
										Skipped	1

Walter Lamb

The Technical Advisory Committee appears to be the only SMBRC body that performs the functions called for in the MOU. Our primary recommendations for improving the TAC are to provide opportunities for the WAC and TAC to collaborate, as called for in the MOU, and to encourage TAC participation in the scientific aspects of more CCMP projects. For instance, the TAC was not asked to comment on the environmental analysis for the Ballona Wetlands Restoration Project, a high CCMP priority.

Anonymous

The TAC is by far the most effective component of the structure. They work well together, listen, solve problems, inform regional monitoring efforts and research, and are comprised of key experts across a range of sciences. They communicate well with the GB/EC and NEP staff and help broaden the effectiveness, importance, and reach of the NEP. They should be commended!

Kathy Knight

We do not hear about their work. It is not presented to the public, and we are not asked to participate. At the WAC meeting, the Ballona Wetlands Land Trust asked to have meetings with the TAC. The WAC/Bay Foundation implied that that was a good idea, but when they reported on the WAC meeting to the Governing Board, they did not even mention this proposal.

Jim Lamm


See previous comments.

Douglas Fay

The TAC is Not Effective at implementing honest actions that will restore and enhance the SMB. Their actions are doing more harm than good.

Martha Tremblay

I will email comments to Guangyu.




Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Effectiveness of Bay Restoration Authority (SMBRA)

Please rate the effectiveness of the Restoration Authority structure in meeting SMBNEP CCMP priorities:

	Don't Know	Not Effective	omewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
Overall	34.21%	13.10.53%	4.18.42%	7.26.32%	10.10.53%	4.38
Managing Projects	33.33%	12.8.33%	3.16.67%	6.25.00%	9.16.67%	6.36
Raising and Expending Funds	41.67%	15.2.78%	1.19.44%	7.25.00%	9.11.11%	4.36
Other (please specify)						7
					Answered	38
					Skipped	2

Richard F. Ambrose	Even though I have been involved with SMBRC for decades, I didn't even know there was a SMBRA until relatively recently and I don't know anything about its effectiveness or activities.
Walter Lamb	The record shows that SMBRA does not operate as an independent public agency, as called for in the JPA, but has rather operated as a public agency shell to allow TBF to enter into government to government contracts for projects that TBF has identified and developed. This is highly problematic and needs to be addressed.
Anonymous	SMBRA seems to largely cause its own challenges from conversations with staff regarding budget constraints. Don't know how well it functions internally.
Jim Lamm	See previous comments.
Douglas Fay	In my lifetime you have done more harm than good to the ecology, the economy, and overall well being of all species.
Martha Tremblay	I have not heard what the authority does.
Cung Nguyen	As a member of the SMBRA, LACFCD strives to protect and enhance the natural resources of Santa Monica Bay and its watersheds in a manner consistent with the goals and responsibilities of the SMBRC and LACFCD



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Effectiveness of The Bay Foundation


Please rate the effectiveness of The Bay Foundation governance structure in meeting SMBNEP CCMP priorities:

	Don't Know	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
Overall	15.00% 6	10.00% 4	5.00% 2	32.50% 13	37.50% 15	40
Developing and Managing Projects	17.50% 7	5.00% 2	5.00% 2	27.50% 11	45.00% 18	40
Informing and Affecting Policy	25.64% 10	7.69% 3	23.08% 9	23.08% 9	20.51% 8	39
Raising and Expending Funds	28.21% 11	2.56% 1	10.26% 4	20.51% 8	38.46% 15	39
Supporting, Funding, and Managing Research and Monitoring of Bay Conditions	17.95% 7	5.13% 2	7.69% 3	23.08% 9	46.15% 18	39
Educating and Engaging Stakeholders	17.50% 7	7.50% 3	25.00% 10	27.50% 11	22.50% 9	40
Other (please specify)						9
Answered						40
Skipped						0

Anonymous	The Bay Foundation is not directly linked to the CCMP governance structure but is effective in implementing programs that are part of the CCMP
Richard F. Ambrose	The question asks about the Bay Foundation's governance structure, but I don't know anything about the governance structure. Therefore, I answered the questions about effectiveness of the Foundation, not the governance structure.
Walter Lamb	TBF appears to be a well run non-profit organization in its own right, but has received poor guidance from US EPA and the State Water Boards regarding the legality of usurping authority legislatively assigned to SMBRC. Although TBF was created by SMBRP in 1990 to help raise funds for SMBRP, most of its funding was already available to SMBRP (and later SMBRC), such as the US EPA Section 320 grants, SCC grants and other grants. Many grants to TBF were in fact recommended by SMBRC. TBF does not appear to have a robust fundraising operation. TBF seems most effective at developing and managing marine projects related to kelp and abalone.
Bob Godfrey	Seems like the goals and plans are continually shifting so it is hard to measure accomplishments. For example they all jumped onto the "climate change" band wagon and lost interest in delinquent plans for more achievable goals such as restoring Ballona wet lands etc..
Anonymous	TBF staff and their partners seem to largely be the drivers of CCMP implementation. Seems the only challenge is translating their work up to the NEP level? Give them more money!
Anonymous	TBF management and staff are well-versed in policy and science regarding SMBNEP. The organization is to be commended for taking an appropriately strong leadership position.
Kathy Knight	Many of us are disappointed with the way the Bay Foundation seems to run everything, and the SMBRC Governing Board just follows their lead. We think the Governing Board should be running things, and the Bay Foundation follow their plans.
Jim Lamm	See previous comments.
Douglas Fay	The Bay Foundation leadership is corrupted to the point that I and others have no respect for their actions. They are extremely effective at implementing actions that harm species and disengage stakeholders. There is little to no accountability oversight. Especially at the Federal level.

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
 How effective is the current governance relationship of the USEPA NEP Program with The Bay Foundation and SMBRC?


Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
8.57%	17.14%	42.86%	31.43%	35
3	6	15	11	Answered
				Skipped
				5



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey


How effective is the current governance relationship of the State Water Resources Control Board with the SMBRC?

Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
4	4	16	9	34
Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Answered
11.76%	11.76%	47.06%	26.47%	Skipped



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
 How effective is the current governance relationship between the SMBRC and The Bay Foundation?

Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
8.57%	11.43%	45.71%	34.29%	35
3	4	16	12	
				Answered
				Skipped
				35
				5



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

What do you see as the unique strengths and attributes of the SMBNEP Management Conference governance structure?

Answered 22
Skipped 18

Richard F. Ambrose	The MC governance structure seems pretty routine. The involvement of the Bay Foundation is more unusual, but it has allowed the SMBNEP to be effective.
Walter Lamb	On paper, the broad representation of the Governing Board, the scientific expertise of the TAC and the stakeholder involvement of the WAC look strong. As explained below, these structures have been undermined by the effort to split the NEP into public and private components, with the public SMBRC being clearly diminished as a result.
Shelley Luce	Open to the public; includes experts from variety of sectors; includes project funders and implementors; keeps different stakeholders informed via GB meetings; improves collaboration and leveraging of effort among many different agencies and groups.
Lawrence Lovell	Unknown
Eric Stein	diversity and strength of staff
Laurie Newman	It is very collaborative and participatory and allows for both private and public funding
Masahiro Dojiri	The TAC is the strength.
Suzanne Goode	Participation by agency stakeholders with the ability to restore and improve conditions of the bay watershed. Provision of staff services by The Bay Foundation.
Anonymous	informative

Anonymous	Questions 17-19 were confusing. Strengths = TAC, NEP staff, partnership development and support, communication and education opportunities. Sounds like utilizing Coastal Research Institute might be another effective research and monitoring tool to build. The benefits of the current structure are the groups around the table at the GB meetings being able to communicate and be 'on the same team'. Sometimes it seems like too much is put on the shoulders of staff.
Anonymous	Multi-jurisdictional and multi-faceted, so combines strengths and collaboration
Chris Newman	The governance structure and objectives are clearly outlined in the MOU's regarding the commission structure and the foundation. I believe the WAC is a vital component for stakeholder engagement and steering specifically as it relates to public engagement. The TAC is necessary for scientific oversight and advising. I believe the foundation is a vital component for efficiently implementing priorities by raising funds and conducting field research and restoration efforts. The merit and effectiveness of this governance structure I believe is confirmed by the existence of other similar structures such as the Morro Bay NEP.
Kathy Knight	If it was run more openly and transparently it would be good.
John H. Dorsey	Representatives of all major stakeholders are represented -- government agencies at the local, State, and Federal levels, resource agencies, key environmental groups. The TAC membership includes scientists with excellent experience, indwell noted in their fields of study.
Phyllis Grifman	Ability to engage a wide range of stakeholders and scientists.
Lucien Plauzoles	Despite many complaints from some stakeholder groups, the NEP structure is able to act as a catch-all well beyond any other structure to enable Bay restoration efforts.

Douglas Fay To lie to the world in plain sight. They have no intentions whatsoever to restore and enhance the Santa Monica Bay. My marine scientist father Dr. Rimmon C. Fay was known as The Father of the Santa Monica Bay. The research done by Rim and his staff at Pacific Bio Marine Laboratory is the sole reason the SMBNEP exists. The fact that there is no recognition of his contributions and that I am essentially banned from participating in the current process (other than this survey) confirms your greatest strength is hatred, which is not unique.

Bill Brand

David Pedersen The breadth and depth of experience and expertise of the various members.

Martha Tremblay The structure seems ok. I just feel more communication would be helpful. I really don't know what happens at WAC or TAC. Does TAC use funds and if so, is this audited?

Cung Nguyen All agencies involved have a vested interest in protecting and enhancing the natural resources of Santa Monica Bay and its watersheds in a manner consistent with their respective goals

Guangyu Wang (on behalf of Jon Bishop and Claire Waggoner) The key feature of the NEP by design is local watershed-based, broad stakeholder presentation and involvement. The current governance structure of the SMBNEP retains this key feature, which is also its greatest asset.


Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Are there governance policies and practices that best contribute to achieving the SMBNEP's goals and objectives?

Answered 19
Skipped 21

Richard F. Ambrose	The mixture of Governing Board, Technical Advisory Committee and Watershed Council provides a good balance of perspectives that contribute to the achievement of the NEP's goals and objectives. But the most important factor in success in achieving those goals and objectives is a dedicated and competent staff.
Walter Lamb	The open nature of the SMBRC meetings is a positive, but because no forums exist to discuss complex issues beyond a surface level, the value of public feedback is greatly diminished. Ending the use of armed sheriff's deputies and allowing public comment on each agenda item were policies pushed by stakeholders that have improved meetings, despite concerns by a small group of members and staff.
Lawrence Lovell	Unknown
Laurie Newman	We have worked on our governance structure for a long time, making changes along the way. I think when one understands the governance structure, which is very complicated, it works well.
Masahiro Dojiri	?
David Kay	Much better public outreach and communication, to the general public at large, and not just "interested stakeholders."
Suzanne Goode	Same as above.
Anonymous	Don't fix what is not broken.
Anonymous	Again, largely staff driven progress seems to be made in practice. GB seems most
Anonymous	--

Kathy Knight	Having the process run openly and transparently and engage the public who want to be engaged.
John H. Dorsey	Good communication between the Governing Board and the staff on project needs, planning, progress, and effectiveness.
Phyllis Grifman	Listening to stakeholders and involving them in policy direction
Lucien Plauzoles	There still seems to be a considerable opacity in the relationships between SMBRC and the Bay Foundation and its staff. Considerable effort has been made to open windows into activities of the Bay Foundation, SMBRC and waterboards staff members, but more is needed.
Douglas Fay	None that are currently proposed and/or implemented. Again, the goal was a 5 year pollution study, proposing and implementing actions that would fully mitigate the damage done to the Bay, and designating the Santa Monica Bay National Marine Sanctuary to ensure sufficient Federal oversight. Over 30 years later, the SWRCB is still controlling the NEP which is completely wrong on many levels. They are allowing the pollution to continue and using Federal funds through the NEP to do so. At the Federal level, the NEP is not enforcing legislation outlined in US Public Law 780 House Document No 389. They have not informed the US Congress of violations that have and continue to occur.
David Pedersen	Yes, the open and transparent governance process.
Martha Tremblay	I liked working together with members of GB on identifying actions to include in the CCMP.
Cung Nguyen	California Legislature (Pub. Res. Code §30988(d).)
Guangyu Wang (on behalf of Jon Bishop and Claire Waggoner)	Effective for a resource-limited program. The effectiveness can be mostly attributed to the collaboration and partnerships among participating stakeholders, including the SMBRC-TBF partnership.



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Are there elements of the current governance structure that could be modified for improved performance?

	Keep as is		Modify Structure		Modify Policies		Modify Practices		Total
Governing Board-Executive Committee	62.50%	15	12.50%	3	0.00%	0	25.00%	6	24
WAC	40.74%	11	25.93%	7	3.70%	1	29.63%	8	27
TAC	76.00%	19	0.00%	0	8.00%	2	16.00%	4	25
The Bay Foundation	80.77%	21	3.85%	1	3.85%	1	11.54%	3	26
Restoration Authority	70.00%	14	15.00%	3	0.00%	0	15.00%	3	20
Please Explain									22
Answered									29
Skipped									11

Anonymous	Keep as is
Richard F. Ambrose	Keep as is
Walter Lamb	Modify Practices
Shelley Luce	Keep as is
Eric Stein	Keep as is
Laurie Newman	Keep as is
Anonymous	Keep as is
Bob Godfrey	Modify Structure
David Kay	Keep as is
Suzanne Goode	Keep as is
Anonymous	Keep as is
Anonymous	Keep as is
Anonymous	Modify Structure
Anonymous	Keep as is
Chris Newman	Modify Practices
Anonymous	Keep as is
Kathy Knight	Modify Practices
John H. Dorsey	Keep as is
Anonymous	Modify Structure
Douglas Fay	Modify Practices
David Pedersen	Keep as is
Martha Tremblay	Modify Practices
Anonymous	Keep as is
Cung Nguyen	Keep as is
Guangyu Wang (on behalf of Jon Bishop and Claire Waggoner)	Modify Practices

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Are there new or modified governance policies and practices that could be implemented that could lead to better achievement of the SMBNEP's goals and objectives?

Answered 16
Skipped 24

Richard F. Ambrose	Not that I can think of.
Walter Lamb	See above. The SMBRC must be restored as the primary face of the NEP, with TBF supporting SMBRC with staff and administrative support. The recently inverted relationship is not only inconsistent with the law, but it sidelines the Governing Board as the decision-making body of the NEP. Additionally, GB and WAC entities that routinely miss meetings should be removed from those bodies until the request reinstatement. It is misleading to list entities as members of those bodies when they are never present. As with the this survey as a whole, we expect our past comments to be incorporated into this review process. Not every previous point is repeated here.
Lawrence Lovell	Unknown
Eric Stein	better coordination and improved clarity of roles between different elements
Laurie Newman	Not that I can think of.
Suzanne Goode	Don't know.
Anonymous	Expedited support for key programs or projects. Additional funding opportunities fast tracked for CCMP
Anonymous	Some members of the public continue to voice inchoate concerns about governance, but it is unclear if any governance changes would actually result in satisfying the few critics.

Chris Newman	<p>As mentioned in one of the previous meetings, the governance structure of the Commission and how it relates to the NEP more broadly as well as TBF is complicated and can be confusing. Even as a past TBF employee and GB alternate, I am continually learning more and better understanding the structure. As a result, I do think that if feasible some basic orientation for new GB members would be helpful. Even if it was in the form of a document condensing the presentation of the gov structure along with the relevant MOUs. I do believe the governance structure is clearly outlined in the MOU, has objectives clearly stated in those documents, and falls within the framework as set out by the EPA. However, in light of recent litigation, there continues to be an issue with among some with the perception of lack of transparency within the governance structure as it relates to the foundation. As a result I believe continuing to find ways to continue to prioritize transparency and to reach out to the public and continue to involve new stakeholders would be a worthwhile effort.</p>
Kathy Knight	<p>Have a process to engage in working with members of the public and non-profit groups that have been working for over 25 years on their projects, but are left out of meaningful engagement on their project, such as the Ballona Wetlands restoration. The DEIR to restore the BWER that the Bay Foundation was very active in did NOT EVEN STUDY an ALTERNATIVE to restore Ballona to a fresh water seasonal wetland that it has been for 400 years. The public was shocked at the DEIR proposal to bulldoze the BWER and create a saltwater wetland that appears to serve as a flood control project for a nearby development.</p>
Jim Lamm	See above.
John H. Dorsey	Ensure funding from the EPA remains secure.
Douglas Fay	Yes
Martha Tremblay	Better communication regarding GB, TAC, and WAC committee updates and projects would lead to increased member engagement and thus better achievement of SMBNEP goals. Also, see WAC comments.
Cung Nguyen	Not at this time


Guangyu Wang
(on behalf of Jon
Bishop and Claire
Waggoner)

Several elements of the current structure can be modified and improved, including the following: 1). The Chair and Executive Committee should provide a stronger leadership in guiding SMBNEP's work priorities and the agenda of the SMBRC, and play a more active role in raising more funding sources to support CCMP implementation. The improvement of the EC function can be benefitted by regular participation of EC meetings by U.S. EPA and SWRCB representatives, the two primary sponsors of the SMBNEP, adding the two agencies as members of the EC if necessary. 2). The current structure of the Watershed Advisory Council should be revamped as it is no longer productive and effective in soliciting input from, and communicating with the general public. It is also to a large degree duplicative of the public involvement function already built into the structure of the Governing Board and the Board meetings. In addition, the large and overlapping membership of the WAC with the Governing Board causes a lot of confusion and create unnecessary administrative burden on staff and all participating members. Potential alternatives to the current WAC structure include a new Public Advisory or Outreach Committee set up by the Governing Board, similar to the structure of the current TAC, or annual or regular public workshop set up to present information on SMBNEP activities and to solicit public input. The current role of the WAC is to provide input to the GB on restoration in the watershed. This could be better accomplished by setting aside time for the public to engage with the GB during regularly scheduled meetings. The Watershed Stakeholder Group could be open to any stakeholders/members of the public to provide input. 3). The SMBRC-TBF partnership can be further improved and strengthened by amendments to the current MOU and MOA to further clarify the roles and responsibilities of each entity, including the designation and roles and responsibilities of the SMBNEP Director. 4). Develop special committees appointed by GB to: (1) engage the legislature and advocate for funding allocations; (2) identify potential funding sources for grants coordinate fundraising activities, (3) conduct public outreach, engage with the public on disseminating information and informing them of opportunities to engage. 5) All governing documents including, but are not limited to the SMBRC MOU, the SMBRA MOU, the MOA between the SMBRC and TBF should be reviewed and brought up-to-date at the end of this process.

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

How well suited is the current governance structure to address Key Management Issues and Challenges looking forward?

	Not at All	A Little	More than a Little	A Lot	Very	Total
	3.23%	9.68%	25.81%	32.26%	29.03%	31
	1	3	8	10	9	
Comments:					7	
					Answered	31
					Skipped	9



Walter Lamb	This was addressed in our response to the previous questionnaire.
Lawrence Lovell	Unknown
Masahiro Dojiri	Due to the work of TAC.
Anonymous	Glad to see climate change is a key initiative in the new action plan.
Kathy Knight	We don't see any changes happening in the management of the SMBRC to address issues and challenges looking forward.
Martha Tremblay	But would like more information on WAC and TAC efforts.
Guangyu Wang (on behalf of Jon Bishop and Claire Waggoner)	See suggestions for improvement above (Q23) and below (Q25)

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Could you suggest any other changes to the current governance structure or suggestions for future governance?

Answered 12
Skipped 28

Walter Lamb	The Land Trust has made numerous and extensive recommendations on this issue over several years. We still don't have answers to basic questions, or meaningful responses to our many comments. Ultimately, what the Land Trust would like to see is not particularly important. What the law requires is important. The Governing Board needs to more actively discuss the recent changes that were imposed on SMBRC without Governing Board discussion. If the Governing Board believes that a model more similar to Morro Bay would be more effective in implementing the CCMP, it should prepare a report to the legislature. Governing Board members should receive training that is fully transparent to the public and which provides SMBRC's legal interpretations of what is required by various statutes, regulations and governing documents.
Lawrence Lovell	Not currently
Masahiro Dojiri	N/A
Suzanne Goode	Promoting greater public awareness of the existence and activities of the SMBNEP.
Anonymous	works really well
Anonymous	Additional committees with a select membership may help take some of the load off staff?
Kathy Knight	As stated before, have a more active role of the SMBRC in making sure that they run the
John H. Dorsey	No.
Lucien Plauzoles	The focus on structure is misplaced in my opinion. The activity and behavior of staff(s) are equally important in the broad scheme of the restoration.
Douglas Fay	Yes
Cung Nguyen	Not at this time

Guangyu Wang (on behalf
of Jon Bishop and Claire
Waggoner)

Review frequency of meetings and coordinate schedules. Reduce frequency of meetings, but perhaps lengthen the meeting time. Schedule them quarterly with key objectives at each meeting (e.g., reviewing and discussing draft CCMP and establishing priorities for annual workplan at one meeting, approving CCMP). • Consider adding a Watershed Outreach Council. Appointed by GB and include the members of GB. Key roles, outreach to legislature for funding, ID other potential funding sources (e.g., existing restoration project grants), opportunities to coordinate on projects (e.g., STORMS, CECs), stakeholder outreach-keeping the public/stakeholders engaged, active and disseminate Commission/NEP products and activities. • Governance document needs to incorporate considerations for climate change and building climate resiliency • Identify ways to keep the governance pieces such as the governing board current and relevant. Also need to consider ways to keep public interest, regain public interest to improve ability to leverage resources. For example, consider integrating social media in the portions related to public outreach. Some items may not be appropriate to include in MOU, but should be included in the discussions to incorporate as appropriate. • Clarify roles and responsibilities, meeting frequency, etc in MOU • Review schedules given staff resources • Need to build in enough time and emphasize the importance of people reading the meeting materials in advance and coming prepared to discuss at meetings. • Investigate utility in JPA, not sure what the role is or could be.

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
Financing/Implementation/Community Private/Public Partnerships. What new or expanded governance, financing, and implementation partnerships should the Management Conference be exploring and developing?

Answered 14
Skipped 26

Richard F. Ambrose I think the Bay Foundation could be raising more funds independently, not just government grants. In fact, besides its involvement with SMBRC, I don't know what TBF does. But it potentially could bring private and foundation donations to the Bay NEP.

Walter Lamb The SMBRC has never requested funding from the legislature and no explanation has ever been given as to why. The SMBRC should restore its deactivated bank account to ensure it can receive funds from the legislature and other sources, including private sources.

Lawrence Lovell Unknown

Christine Whitcraft Increased ties with Southern CA Wetlands Recovery Project

Laurie Newman I think the state needs to contribute funding and that we need to develop more private funding opportunities

Anonymous Climate change adaptation

Masahiro Dojiri Nothing to add.

Suzanne Goode Provision of staff by the State.

Anonymous additional proposition funding. Measure W. Sponsorship from donors?

Giovanni Di Franco


Anonymous New funding opportunities via state appropriations seems limited, but the conference should continue to pursue legislation leading to new bond funding, or Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) appropriations.

Kathy Knight	Helping non-profits with some financing for their work.
John H. Dorsey	None that I can think of--outside my area expertise
Martha Tremblay	Is there an auditing process in place? How do we know how much money is being spent? Who sees the information?
Cung Nguyen	Continue to have Bay Foundation attend National Estuary Program Conferences/Workshops and report back recommendations to SMBRC. Continue to gather input/comments and recommendation from SMBRC Governing Board members.

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey
 How active would you like to be in the SMBNEP going forward?

None at All	Very Little	Slightly	Moderately	A Lot	Total
0.00%	2.86%	8.57%	34.29%	54.29%	35
0	1	3	12	19	
					Answered
					Skipped

35
5



Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

How could you become better engaged with the SMBNEP? (What factors would increase your interest in and engagement with the SMBNEP?)

Answered 14
Skipped 26

Richard F. Ambrose I am already actively engaged, and I would want to continue that.

Walter Lamb As we have stated many times, forums such as work groups, committees and task forces that allow more nuanced discussion of complex policy issues would engage more stakeholders and lead to better outcomes. Other NEPs do this (see for example Tillamook Bay NEP bylaws), and it is the only efficient way to form sound policy on a range of complex issues without substantially increasing meeting times for the full Governing Board. It is our belief that years of friction between SMBRC/TBF and the public led to a desire by SMBRC/TBF to tightly control all aspects of policy discussion, which has reduced engagement and created polarization.

Lawrence Lovell More projects focused on marine invertebrate communities of concern that face potential impacts.

Bob Godfrey If I had the time I would attend the Executive Board and TAC Meetings.

David Kay If I saw them more vocally, publically advocating and defending the CDFW's Ballona Wetlands Restoration Project

Anonymous Could have more frequent announcements/communication - reach out to GB members for announcements too? Less

Anonymous Please see previous comments.

Kathy Knight If the SMBRC and the Bay Foundation showed interest in working with the non-profit groups that have been volunteering their time for over 20 years to protect and restore the Ballona wetlands to the fresh water seasonal wetland that it is.

Jim Lamm There probably would need to be changes to my personal life that might free up my time and which are unrelated to the SMBNEP. My personal life is very good, but I've taken on some significant faith-based volunteer leadership roles and have ongoing extended family responsibilities in addition to my volunteer role as a BCR outreach person and advisor. Hopefully others at BCR will be able to become more directly involved.

John H. Dorsey	Continuing research activities with the Bay Foundation through the Coastal Research Institute and work with the TAC.
Douglas Fay	After significant changes are made.
Martha Tremblay	Better communication regarding GB, TAC, and WAC committee updates and projects would give stakeholders more context in which to increase engagement.
Cung Nguyen	Continue to support SMBNEP projects and strengthen existing partnership. Better align priorities of LACPW and SMDNEP.
Guangyu Wang (on behalf of Jon Bishop and Claire Waggoner)	See suggestions above (Q23 and 25)

Santa Monica Bay National Estuary Program Governance Review eSurvey

Other Comments:

Answered	8
Skipped	32

Walter Lamb	<p>As with the previous questionnaire, the Land Trust believes this survey is self-serving and conspicuously missing any questions that would solicit direct feedback on issues that TBF may find uncomfortable. It is clear to us that there is a desired end state in mind and that this process was designed from the start to legitimize that end state. To ask GB members to simply read legislation and each interpret that legislation as they will, without any legal guidance, is unproductive. There has been no discussion of the historical changes to SMBRC's structure, no discussion of past handling of the Section 320 funds, no discussion of changed staffing levels, no discussion of how SMBRC and TBF align in the wake of the terminated shared board membership. We believe that this process has been a missed opportunity so far, with little time remaining for a course correction, and that the funds to support this effort have been misspent. I filled out the survey on behalf of the Land Trust to ensure that we are making every good faith effort to provide constructive feedback.</p>
Bob Godfrey	<p>It is hard to get stakeholders interested in investing their personal time when they do not see any tangible benefits in the plans.</p>
Anonymous	<p>Great work!! You all do an incredible amount of work and have achieved amazing successes, and we are pleased to be partners. There are certainly things that could be improved, but you do fantastic work in spite of those challenges and with what seems like an overwhelming list of tasks. I do hope the organization continues to grow. -Staying Anonymous because of the threat of a contentious few.</p>
Kathy Knight	<p>We support the Ballona Wetlands Land Trust efforts to get the SMBRC and SMBNEP run in a more open and transparent fashion that would support public input and involvement. Right now it seems to be run by a private non-profit, the Bay Foundation, that is not subject to the same rules of transparency that a government group would be.</p>
Jim Lamm	<p>Thank you for all you do.</p>
Douglas Fay	<p>Neither Dr Wang or US EPA Region 9 representatives have replied to my emails of concern on this subject. Why?</p>

Martha Tremblay

It would be helpful if there was a flow diagram on the SMBRC website which depicts the relationship of the governance structure elements of the SMBNEP to one another.

Guangyu Wang (on behalf of Jon Bishop and Claire Waggoner)

Have updated lists of who is serving on the various committees and their alternates. Add the Executive Committee to MOU. Include eligibility, appointment, roles and responsibilities, meeting schedule, etc. Identify the need for and define the roles and responsibilities of the Executive Director of the Commission. Define the roles and responsibilities of the NEP Director, include how they are appointed and term, if any or if ex-officio. Clarify and delineate roles and responsibilities of TBF vs Commission Focus on re-engaging people in this program, governance, and assisting with outreach for the program